

Remarks/Arguments

The foregoing amendments to the claims are of formal nature, and do not add new matter. Claims 119-131 are pending in this application and are rejected on various grounds. Claim 128 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 119-124 have been amended for clarity and with the functional recitation: "wherein, the nucleic acid encoding said polypeptide is amplified in squamous cell carcinomas of lung." Support for this recitation is found in the instant specification in Example 170, especially Table 8, page 546. Claim 130 has been amended for proper claim dependency. The rejections to the presently pending claims are respectfully traversed.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101 and 112, first paragraph

Claims 119-131 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 allegedly "because the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility." Claims 119-131 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph allegedly "since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility, one skilled in the art would not know how to use the claimed invention".

The Examiner asserts that the specification does not disclose a function for the polypeptides against SEQ ID NO: 399. While the Examiner acknowledges that the nucleic acids encoding PRO1187 shows a positive correlation for lung cancer, the Examiner quotes Haynes *et al.*, Pennica *et al.* and Konopka *et al.* to show that "protein expression shows a poor correlation with mRNA expression" and further says that "the increased copy number of DNA does not provide a readily apparent use for the polypeptide, for which there is no information regarding level of expression, activity or role in cancer". The Examiner also points out that "function cannot be predicted based solely on structural similarity to a protein found in the sequence databases" and quotes exemplary literature reports like Karp and Skolnick *et al.* to support this position. For the reasons outlined below, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Utility Guidelines

According to the Utility Examination Guidelines (“Utility Guidelines”), 66 Fed. Reg. 1092 (2001) an invention complies with the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 101, if it has at least one asserted “specific, substantial, and credible utility” or a “well-established utility.”

Under the Utility Guidelines, a utility is “specific” when it is particular to the subject matter claimed. For example, it is generally not enough to state that a nucleic acid is useful as a diagnostic without also identifying the conditions that is to be diagnosed.

The requirement of “substantial utility” defines a “real world” use, and derives from the Supreme Court’s holding in *Brenner v. Manson*, 383 U.S. 519, 534 (1966) stating that “The basic *quid pro quo* contemplated by the Constitution and the Congress for granting a patent monopoly is the benefit derived by the public from an invention with substantial utility.” In explaining the “substantial utility” standard, M.P.E.P. 2107.01 cautions, however, that **Office personnel must be careful not to interpret the phrase “immediate benefit to the public”** or similar formulations used in certain court decisions to mean that products or services based on the claimed invention must be “currently available” to the public in order to satisfy the utility requirement. “Rather, any reasonable use that an applicant has identified for the invention that can be viewed as providing a public benefit should be accepted as sufficient, at least with regard to defining a “substantial” utility.” (M.P.E.P. 2107.01, emphasis added.) Indeed, the Guidelines for Examination of Applications for Compliance with the Utility Requirement, set forth in M.P.E.P. 2107 II (B) (1) gives the following instruction to patent examiners: “If the (A)pplicant has asserted that the claimed invention is useful for any particular practical purpose . . . and the assertion would be considered credible by a person of ordinary skill in the art, do not impose a rejection based on lack of utility.”

Finally, the Utility Guidelines restate the Patent Office’s long established position that any asserted utility has to be “credible.” “Credibility is assessed from the perspective of one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the disclosure and any other evidence of record . . . that is probative of the Applicant’s assertions.” (M.P.E.P. 2107 II (B) (1) (ii)) Such standard is presumptively satisfied unless the logic underlying the assertion is seriously flawed, or if the facts upon which the assertion is based are inconsistent with the logic underlying the assertion (Revised Interim Utility Guidelines Training Materials, 1999).

To overcome the presumption of truth based on an assertion of utility by the Applicant, the Examiner must establish that **it is more likely than not** that one of ordinary skill in the art would doubt the truth of the statement of utility. **Absolute predictability is not a requirement.** Only after the Examiner has made a proper *prima facie* showing of lack of utility, does the burden of rebuttal shift to the applicant. The issue will then be decided on the totality of evidence.

Arguments

The Examiner bases her conclusion, that "function cannot be predicted based solely on structural similarity to a protein found in the sequence databases" on exemplary literature reports like Karp and Skolnick *et al.* Initially, Applicants submit that the claimed utility for the PRO1187 protein and its antibody is based on its use in the diagnosis of lung cancer and is not based on structural similarity to known proteins. As explained below, Applicants rely on the gene amplification data for patentable utility of this case.

Gene amplification is an essential mechanism for oncogene activation and the assay is well-described in Example 170, page 539 of the present application. The gene amplification data shows that genomic DNA was isolated from a variety of primary cancers and cancer cell lines listed in Table 9 (especially page 554, Table 9C) which includes primary lung cancers of the type and stage indicated in Table 8 (page 546). As a negative control, DNA was isolated from the cells of ten normal healthy individuals, which was pooled and used as a control (page 539, lines 27-29). Gene amplification was monitored using real-time quantitative TaqMan™ PCR and the results are set forth in Table 9C. As explained in the passage on page 539, lines 37-39, "the results of TaqMan™ PCR are reported in ΔC_t units. **One unit** corresponds to one PCR cycle or approximately a **2-fold amplification**, relative to control, two units correspond to 4-fold, 3 units to 8-fold amplification and so on" (emphasis added). Table 9C indicates that PRO1187 showed approximately 1.17-1.55 ΔC_t units which corresponds to $2^{1.17}$ - $2^{1.55}$ - fold amplification or **2.25-fold to 2.928-fold** amplification in squamous cell carcinomas of lung (see Table 8, page 546), which is significant and thus the PRO1187 gene has utility as a diagnostic marker.

A prima facie case of lack of utility has not been established

The Examiner bases her conclusion, that increases in gene copy number does not reliably correlate with increased gene expression or polypeptide expression, on Haynes *et al.*, Pennica *et al.* and Konopka *et al.*, and concludes that PRO1187 polypeptides lack utility.

First, the Examiner says that "Haynes *et al.* studied 80 proteins... and found no strong correlation between proteins and transcript levels." Applicants respectfully traverse and point out that, on the contrary, Haynes teaches that "**there was a general trend** but no strong correlation between protein [expression] and transcript levels" (Emphasis added). Haynes studied 80 yeast proteins to show that "protein levels cannot be **accurately** predicted from the level of the corresponding mRNA transcript" (Emphasis added) (see page 1863, paragraph 2.1, last line). For example, in Figure 1, there is a positive correlation between mRNA and protein amongst **most** of the 80 yeast proteins studied but the correlation is "not linear" and hence, "one cannot **accurately** predict protein levels from mRNA levels." In fact, very few data points deviated or scattered away from the expected normal or showed a lack of correlation between mRNA: protein levels. Thus, the Haynes data meets the "more likely than not standard" and shows that a positive correlation exists between mRNA and protein.

Pennica *et al.* teaches that "An analysis of *WISP*-1 gene amplification and expression in human colon tumors **showed a correlation between DNA amplification and over-expression**, In contrast, *WISP*-2 DNA was amplified in colon tumors, but its mRNA expression was significantly reduced in the majority of tumors compared with expression in normal colonic mucosa from the same patient." (Emphasis added). The Applicants draw attention to Pennica's showing that "a correlation between DNA amplification and over-expression exists for the *WISP*-1 gene" in 84% of the tumors examined. While Pennica discloses a lack of correlation for the *WISP*-2 gene, Pennica teaches nothing regarding such a lack of correlation in genes in general. That is, Pennica's teachings are specific for the *WISP* family of genes, and are not directed to genes in general. The Utility Guidelines requires that for a *prima facie* showing of lack of utility, the Examiner has to provide evidence that it is **more likely than not** that a lack of correlation between protein expression and gene amplification exists, in general. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully submit that Pennica teaches nothing of the correlation between gene amplification and polypeptide over-expression in general.

Finally, the Examiner cites the abstract of Konopka *et al.* to establish that “[p]rotein expression is not related to the amplification of the *abl* gene” Again, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has generalized a result pertaining to merely **one** gene, the *abl* gene, to cover all genes in general. Konopka does not disclose any generalized teaching about the correlation between protein expression and gene amplification. Applicants submit that the Konopka reference is not sufficient to establish such a *prima facie* showing of lack of utility based on the results with the *abl* gene alone. Thus, the combined teachings of Pennica and Konopka are not directed towards genes in general but to single genes or genes within a family and thus, their teachings have been misrepresented in this rejection.

In conclusion, the Examiner has not shown that a lack of correlation between gene amplification: polypeptide over-expression, as observed for the *WISP-2* or the *abl* genes, is typical. In fact, contrary to what the Examiner contends, the art indicates that, if a gene is amplified in cancer, it is **more likely than not** that the encoded protein will be expressed at an elevated level. As noted even in Pennica *et al.*, a correlation between DNA amplification: polypeptide over-expression was observed in the case of *WISP-1* and similarly, in Haynes *et al.*, **most genes** showed a correlation between increased mRNA : translated protein. Since the standard is not absolute certainty, a *prima facie* showing of lack of utility has not been made in this instance.

It is "more likely than not" for amplified genes to have increased mRNA and protein levels

Applicants submit further exemplary articles to show that, contrary to what the Examiner asserts, just as in Haynes, the art indicates that, generally, if a gene is amplified in cancer, it is **more likely than not** that the encoded protein will be expressed at an elevated level. For example, Orntoft *et al.* (Mol. and Cell. Proteomics, 2002, Vol.1, pages 37-45) studied transcript levels of 5600 genes in malignant bladder cancers many of which were linked to the gain or loss of chromosomal material using an array-based method. Orntoft *et al.* showed that there was a

gene dosage effect and taught that "in general (18 of 23 cases) chromosomal areas with more than 2-fold gain of DNA showed a corresponding increase in mRNA transcripts" (see column 1, abstract). In addition, Hyman *et al.* (Cancer Res., 2002, Vol. 62, pages 6240-45) showed, using CGH analysis and cDNA microarrays which compared DNA copy numbers and mRNA expression of over 12,000 genes in breast cancer tumors and cell lines, that there was "evidence of a prominent global influence of copy number changes on gene expression levels." (see page 6244, column 1, last paragraph). Additional supportive teachings were also provided by Pollack *et al.*, (PNAS, 2002, Vol. 99, pages 12963-12968) who studied a series of primary human breast tumors and showed that "...62% of highly amplified genes show moderately or highly elevated expression, and DNA copy number influences gene expression across a wide range of DNA copy number alterations (deletion, low-, mid- and high-level amplification), and that on average, a 2-fold change in DNA copy number is associated with a corresponding 1.5-fold change in mRNA levels." Thus, these articles collectively teach that in general, gene amplification increases mRNA expression.

In addition, enclosed is a Declaration by Dr. Polakis, principal investigator of the Tumor Antigen Project of Genentech, Inc., the assignee of the present application to show that mRNA expression correlates well with protein levels, in general. As Dr. Polakis explains, the primary focus of the microarray project was to identify tumor cell markers useful as targets for both the diagnosis and treatment of cancer in humans. The scientists working on the project extensively rely on results of microarray experiments in their effort to identify such markers. As Dr. Polakis explains, using microarray analysis, Genentech scientists have identified approximately 200 gene transcripts (mRNAs) that are present in human tumor cells at significantly higher levels than in corresponding normal human cells. To date, they have generated antibodies that bind to about 30 of the tumor antigen proteins expressed from these differentially expressed gene transcripts and have used these antibodies to quantitatively determine the level of production of these tumor antigen proteins in both human cancer cells and corresponding normal cells. Having compared the levels of mRNA and protein in both the tumor and normal cells analyzed, they found a very good correlation between mRNA and corresponding protein levels. Specifically, in approximately 80% of their observations they have found that increases in the level of a particular mRNA correlates with changes in the level of protein expressed from that mRNA.

While the proper legal standard is to show that the existence of correlation between mRNA and polypeptide levels is more likely than not, the showing of approximately 80% correlation for the molecules tested in the Polakis Declaration greatly exceed this legal standard. Based on these experimental data and his vast scientific experience of more than 20 years, Dr. Polakis states that, for human genes, increased mRNA levels typically correlate with an increase in abundance of the encoded protein. He further confirms that "it remains a central dogma in molecular biology that increased mRNA levels are predictive of corresponding increased levels of the encoded protein."

Taken together, although there are some examples in the scientific art that do not fit within the central dogma of molecular biology, that there is a correlation between polypeptide and mRNA levels, these instances are exceptions rather than the rule. In the vast majority of amplified genes, the teachings in the art, as exemplified by Orntoft *et al.*, Hyman *et al.*, Pollack *et al.*, and the Polakis declaration, overwhelmingly show that gene amplification influences gene expression at the mRNA and protein levels. Thus, one of skill in the art would reasonably expect in this instance, based on the amplification data for the PRO1187 gene, that the PRO1187 protein is concomitantly overexpressed. Thus, Applicants submit that the PRO1187 proteins have utility in the diagnosis of cancer and based on such a utility, one of skill in the art would know exactly how to use the protein for diagnosis of cancer.

Claimed proteins would have diagnostic utility even if the protein were not overexpressed

Even assuming *arguendo* that, there is no correlation between gene amplification and increased mRNA/protein expression for PRO1187, which Applicants submit is not true, a polypeptide encoded by a gene that is amplified in squamous cell carcinomas of lung would **still** have a credible, specific and substantial utility. In support, Applicants submit a Declaration by Avi Ashkenazi, Ph.D., an expert in the field of cancer biology and an inventor of the instant application. Dr. Avi Ashkenazi's Declaration explains that:

even when amplification of a cancer marker gene does not result in significant over-expression of the corresponding gene product, this very absence of gene product over-expression still provides significant information for cancer diagnosis and treatment. Thus, if over-expression of the gene product does not parallel gene amplification in certain tumor

types but does so in others, then parallel monitoring of gene amplification and gene product over-expression enables more accurate tumor classification and hence better determination of suitable therapy. In addition, absence of over-expression is crucial information for the practicing clinician. If a gene is amplified but the corresponding gene product is not over-expressed, the clinician accordingly will decide not to treat a patient with agents that target that gene product.

Applicants thus submit that simultaneous testing of gene amplification and gene product over-expression enables more accurate tumor classification, even if the gene-product, the protein, is not over-expressed. This leads to better determination of a suitable therapy. Further, as explained in Dr. Ashkenazi's Declaration, absence of over-expression of the protein itself is crucial information for the practicing clinician. If a gene is amplified in a tumor, but the corresponding gene product is not over-expressed, the clinician need not treat a patient with agents that target that gene product. This not only saves money, but further prevents unnecessary exposure of the patient to the side effects of gene product targeted agents.

This is further supported by the teachings of the attached article by Hanna and Mornin. The article teaches that the HER-2/neu gene has been shown to be amplified and/or over-expressed in 10%-30% of invasive breast cancers and in 40%-60% of intraductal breast carcinoma. Further, the article teaches that diagnosis of breast cancer includes testing both the amplification of the HER-2/neu gene (by FISH) as well as the over-expression of the HER-2/neu gene product (by IHC). Even when the protein is not over-expressed, the assay relying on both tests leads to a more accurate classification of the cancer and a more effective treatment of it.

In conclusion, Applicants have demonstrated a credible, specific and substantial asserted utility for the PRO1187 polypeptide based on the gene amplification results for the nucleic acid, for example, in detecting over-expression or absence of expression of PRO1187. In fact, the art also indicates that, if a gene is amplified in cancer, it is **more likely than not** that the encoded protein will also be expressed at an elevated level. Based on these discussions, one skilled in the art, at the time the application was filed, would know how to use the claimed polypeptides, without undue experimentation.

Thus, Applicants have demonstrated utility for the PRO1187 polypeptide in squamous cell carcinomas of lung. Accordingly, the present 35 U.S.C. §101 and §112, first paragraph utility rejections should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112, first paragraph- Written description

Claims 119-131 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner contends that the claims contain subject matter not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection to the pending claims.

The Legal standard for Written Description

The well- established test for sufficiency of support under the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is whether the disclosure "reasonably conveys to the artisan that the inventor had possession at that time of the later claimed subject matter." *In re Kaslow*, 707 F.2d 1366, 1375, 212 USPQ 1089, 1096 (Fed. Cir. 1983); see also *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F. 2d at 1563, 19 USPQ2d at 1116 (Fed. cir. 1991). The adequacy of written description support is a factual issue and is to be determined on a case-by-case basis. see e.g. *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F. 2d at 1563, 19 USPQ2d at 1116 (Fed. cir. 1991). The factual determination in a written description analysis depends on the nature of the invention and the amount of knowledge imparted to those skilled in the art by the disclosure. *Union Oil v. Atlantic Richfield Co.*, 208 F. 3d 989, 996 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

Arguments

As noted above, whether the Applicants were in possession of the invention as of the effective filing date of an application is a factual determination, reached by the consideration of a number of factors, including the level of knowledge and skill in the art, and the teaching provided by the specification. The inventor is not required to describe every single detail of

his/her invention. An Applicant's disclosure obligation varies according to the art to which the invention pertains.

The present invention pertains to the field of recombinant DNA/protein technology. It is well established that the level of skill in this field is very high since a representative person of skill is generally a Ph.D. scientist with several years of experience. Accordingly, the teaching imparted in the specification must be evaluated through the eyes of a highly skilled artisan as of the date the invention was made. The instant invention, defined by the claims, concerns polypeptides having 80%, 85%, 90%, 95% or 99% sequence identity with the disclosed polypeptide sequence SEQ ID NO: 284 and further, with the functional recitation: "wherein the nucleic acid encoding said polypeptide is amplified in squamous cell carcinomas of lung." Based on the detailed description of the cloning and expression of variants of PRO1187 in the specification, the description of the gene amplification assay and description of testing the ability of test variant polypeptides in the assay, the actual reduction to practice of sequence SEQ ID NO: 284 and the functional recitation in the instant claims, Applicants submit that one of skilled in the art would know that Applicants possessed the invention as claimed in the instant claims.

Hence, Applicants submit that this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

Claims 119-124 and 129-131 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for being indefinite. The Examiner alleges that the protein identified as PRO1187 has several transmembrane domains while the claims recite "the extracellular domain." The Examiner alleges that if there are several transmembrane domains there must be several extracellular domains, and it is unclear which extracellular domain is intended.


Without acquiescing to the propriety of this rejection, Applicants have canceled references to "the extracellular domain" and "the extracellular domain....lacking its associated signal sequence" in the pending claims. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

The present application is believed to be in *prima facie* condition for allowance, and an early action to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-1641 (Attorney Docket No.: 39780-2730P1C40). Please direct any calls in connection with this application to the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 18, 2004



Daphne Reddy
Reg. No. 53,507

HELLER EHRMAN WHITE & McAULIFFE LLP

Customer No. 35489

275 Middlefield Road

Menlo Park, California 94025

Telephone: (650) 324-7000

Facsimile: (650) 324-0638

2026932